UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

Duty to Civilization (*Part IX*)

By FRANCIS NEILSON

Walt Whitman

By GEORGE WILLIS COOKE

The Silent Suffering of the Old in Germany

By BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Gandhi

By ANGELA MORGAN

VOLUME LXXXVIII NUMBER 1

Chicago, September 1, 1921

PUBLISHED BI-WEEKLY

UNITY

ESTABLISHED 1878

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE
Pamphlet Mission
FOR
FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER
IN
RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:
Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Francis L. Roberts, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—
Notes.—J. H. H. 3
Duty to Civilization. Part IX (*Conclusion*).—Francis Neilson 5

CONTRIBUTED—
Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature. X. Walt Whitman.—George Willis Cooke 10
The Silent Suffering of the Old in Germany.—Brent Dow Allinson 13

CORRESPONDENCE—
A Proposed Amendment to the Constitution.—Charles F. Dole 13
Significance of British Navalism and Disarmament Conference.—Taraknath Das 14
Regeneration.—Frida M. Spiering 14

POETRY—
Gandhi.—Angela Morgan 3
When All Is Done.—*Paul Laurence Dunbar* 10

THE FIELD—
The Union of East and West.—*K. N. Das Gupta* 15
A Letter from Germany.—B. D. A. 15
The Community Church and the Nation Church.—*The World and the New Dispensation* 15

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXVIII. THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1921 NUMBER 1

GANDHI.

Not with a clamor of golden deeds,
Nor girt with brazen armor, doth he come.
No herald trumpets him, on royal steeds,
His armies follow not with martial drum.
Nor sword, nor shield, nor helmet hath he known
Whose sun but now hath risen in its place;
Whose kingdom cometh grandly to its own
Mid the eternal triumphs of the race.

Have you at times been swept beyond all creed
By some new-dawning Vision of the right,
Your mind ablaze with thoughts of human need,
Drawn heaven-ward within a wakeful night?
Have you then said, your faint soul strong at last:
"Whatever be the torture of this goal,
Here and here only shall my lot be cast—
This is the plan God fashioned for my soul!"

Then look on Gandhi, Hindu saint and seer;
Lo, in the living flesh behold your vow—
The ancient Truth grown intimate and near,
That God may find His image, here and now.
Here is the heart that dares defy the strain
And terror of conditions as they are;
Here is the sturdy will immune to pain,
Here is the soul that dares become a star!

Here is the noble intellect that saw
Beyond the spasm of our human lust
The silent grandeur of Eternal Law
Wheeling its winged way above our dust,
And linked his being with that lofty scheme,
And ordered all his ways, that he might find
Out of the Infinite a way supreme
To bring immortal justice for his kind.

How like a sun he shines above our dearth!
How like a man he leans unto the earth.
He is the answer to your faith and mine—
Man by his love for man, becomes divine.

ANGELA MORGAN.

King Features Syndicate, Inc., New York.

UNITY has had, and still has, many good and true friends. None among them all excelled in devotion the late Mrs. Jessie E. Shears-Carnovale, for long President of the Board of Directors of this paper. When Jenkin Lloyd Jones determined to put UNITY on enduring foundations by raising the $30,000 fund, it was Mrs. Carnovale who was foremost in the conduct of the campaign which resulted in the successful establishment of this endowment. When Dr. Jones died and left sorrow and almost despair behind, it was Mrs. Carnovale who resolved that, whatever else happened, UNITY should go on. In the last four years, Mrs. Carnovale has been a tower of strength, giving unfailing support to the editors while herself leading in ways of intelligent, patient and far-seeing control. What she did for UNITY was matched by her service in many other fields of beneficent activity. At Abraham Lincoln Centre and Frederick Douglas Center, in the Chicago Woman's Club and the Woman's City Club, she was a tireless worker, self-forgetting, self-sacrificing, generous, and always by sheer power of mind and heart, a leader among her fellows. Especially beautiful was her interest in later years in the Italian people and her work for the betterment of conditions among Italian immigrants, a cause to which she was quickened by her devotion to her husband, Prof. Luigi Carnovale. UNITY is proud and happy to have held so long, and shared in such generous measure, the support of this noble woman. Her life, with that of her beloved friend, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, is a heritage of which it would strive earnestly to be worthy.

The Christian Register (August 18) refers to "our friend, UNITY, (which) doesn't like many things in this world." Thanks, brother, for the compliment! There are indeed "many things in this world" which we don't like. Here are some of them—disease, poverty, prostitution, tenements and slums, the liquor traffic and boot-legging, sweated labor, child labor, the twelve-hour day and seven-day week in industry, profiteering, landlordism, special privilege, industrial monopoly, economic imperialism, war, armaments, secret diplomacy, exploitation of dependent peoples, lynching, race prejudice, intolerance, bigotry, Pharisaism, partisanship in politics, denominationalism in religion, class consciousness in industry, ease without work, luxury without labor, slavery, misery, and all injustice. These are some of the "many things in this world" which we don't like, and which we propose to fight so long as we are able to pay for paper, printing, and postage. Thanks again, dear *Register,* for thus commending us! Like the man who was loved for the enemies that he had made, we would gladly be known by the things that we don't like.

To the complete pacifist it is enormously comforting to note the rapidity and unanimity with which all his prophecies are being verified and all his principles adopted as true. This pacifist, of course, has never had any doubts as to the validity of his position, and does not need, therefore, the confirmation of assenting opinion to strengthen his faith. But it is mightily gratifying, all the same, to find the heresies ridiculed, denounced and punished yesterday, suddenly become the accepted orthodoxy of to-day. Take the issue of preparedness, for example! Back in 1915 and 1916, before the United States had entered the War, the pacifist was pre-eminently distinguished by his assertion that armaments on land and sea were not pre-

ventive, but on the contrary were provocative, of war. With the nations of Europe, armed to the teeth for years, all plunged into the horrors of the Great War, it would seem as though this anti-preparedness doctrine had sound basis in fact! But it was "despised and rejected," and its advocates crucified. *Now,* with the War well behind us, President Harding calls a conference on disarmament, and in his official invitations to England, France, Italy and Japan, declares that "the rivalries of armaments . . . (are) not only without economic justification, but (are) *a constant menace to the peace of the world rather than an assurance of its preservation.*"

There ye hev it plain and flat,

as James Russell Lowell put it in his *Biglow Papers!* Armaments do nothing to preserve peace among the nations of the earth; on the contrary, they constitute "a constant menace" to this peace. This is now the opinion not of hunted and imprisoned pacifists merely, but of the government of the United States. This indicates amazing progress. Not often in the past has heresy become so swiftly and surely respectable as in this case.

Is there an abler statesman, a nobler public servant in this country to-day, than Senator Borah, of Idaho? In propounding this question we are thinking at the moment not of his superb fight against the Peace Treaty, nor yet of his Amendment to the Naval Bill, providing for a disarmament conference, but of an article from his pen in *The Nation's Business,* the official organ of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. In this he says, among other things,

> The obstacle (to disarmament) which seems to me the greatest . . . is one which we will not admit exists, and that is the reliance which we have come to have on force as the only power left on earth with which to govern men. . . . To deify force, to make it the dominating factor, to sit at conference with your finger pointing back over your shoulder to your armies and navies, and to announce to the world that it is your ultimate reliance, is barbaric—and it is none the less barbaric when it is practiced by professedly Christian nations. For myself, I refuse to concede that force is the only power left, or that it should be the dominating and controlling power. It cannot be possible. Reason and justice must still have their place in the affairs of the world, and if leaders and statesmen are strong enough to place their reliance upon them, they will go far.

Here is the utterance of one who is himself a statesman! Any brigand or pirate can use force, and for a time at least control people to his ends. But to rule by the power of the spirit, this marks the true man —and in the end the only successful man. Only such a ruler "will go far."

In this same article, Senator Borah makes an interesting comment on the present armament costs of the allied powers. Germany, he says, "is expected to pay an indemnity annuity of $500,000,000 plus 26 per cent of the actual value of her exports." A careful estimate shows that, during a period of forty years, this obligation will average not more than $823,000,000 per year. Meanwhile, the United States expended for military and naval purposes from June 30, 1920, to June 30, 1921, $825,337,939! The army and navy bills passed by the present Congress incur an expenditure for the present fiscal year of $830,000,000, "perhaps more"!

> "The British army and navy combined," says the Senator, "call for an expenditure much larger than our own. Thus while Germany has her billions of reparations, the allied and associated powers are spending their billions for their armies and navies—we alone expending as much as the entire reparations claims against Germany."

And Germany, thanks to the kind consideration of her enemies, has no army and navy to bother her with the spending of a single mark!

> "The burden of armaments has been forced from the backs of the German people," says Borah. "They may now devote their energies to agriculture, to industry, to the arts, to the things which constitute the real wealth and strength of a people."

What wonder, in the face of such a situation, that the Senator prophesies that

> despite her military defeat, Germany, by reason of the short-sighted and blundering policies of the allied and associated powers, may yet secure economic dominance of Europe.

It's an interesting question as to who won the war, after all!

Lord Bryce's indictment of the Versailles Peace is an important confirmation of the criticisms visited upon it from more radical quarters. Still more important are his utterances in regard to what must now be done to mend matters in the future. Of all his more constructive addresses at Williams College none can compare in significance with that in which he pleads for a codification of international law, the establishment of sanctions for such law, and thus the ordering of relations between states on the same basis as now pertains between individual citizens in each state. It is amazing how this aspect of the problem of peace is either ignored, or not understood at all. We recognize war as one of the crowning evils of human life upon this planet; but we fail to recognize that, for all its horrors, war is not, and never has been at any time, a crime. On the contrary, war is a perfectly legal and therefore proper institution—like chattel slavery, for example, in the days before 1865. Technically considered, war must be defined as the final method of settling disputes between nations. International law, as we call it, is practically nothing more than a set of rules for the conduct of war, like the old codes controlling the duel. Under the provisions of this law, it is a perfectly proper thing for one nation to declare war upon another nation if, in its good judgment, no other way is open for the settlement of existing controversy. Germany, for example, acted entirely within her rights in 1914 when she declared war upon Russia and thus precipitated the European cataclysm! Now it is this status of barbarism, corresponding exactly to the situation when duel-

ling was a legal method of settling disputes—especially of *honor!*—between individuals, that Lord Bryce would end. By a codification of international law into a kind of international constitution, with a court and appropriate sanctions, he would outlaw war as duelling has been outlawed, and put in its place the judicial process. By the consent of nations, in other words, war would be made a crime, like piracy. If a nation went to war under such conditions of law and order, there could be no neutrality, any more than there can be neutrality when a gunman shoots up a town. A declaration of war is itself *prima facie* evidence of crime, subject to trial and penalty at the hands of established international justice! What we have in the peace question after all, so far at least as reform is concerned, is not an intricate problem of political, economic and social forces. We have a simple method of legal procedure for settling disputes. Today we have the method of violence. Why not substitute therefor the method of law?

The welcome news has been received that the Presbyterians of Canada have finally voted to join the proposed denominational merger with the Congregationalists and the Methodists! We are a little uncertain as to the exact status of the negotiations which have been carried on for so many years between these three prominent sectarian bodies of the Dominion; but we believe that the Congregationalists and the Methodists have already taken favorable action, and that this recent vote of the Presbyterians thus seals the compact. If so, a step of momentous importance has been taken in the direction of a united Protestantism. Three competing sects are gotten out of the way, and only one is left in their place! Furthermore, a challenge is spoken to every separatist group throughout the religious world: if these three sectarian bodies can get together, why not others? If the Congregationalists, Methodists and Presbyterians of Canada, for example, can unite, why should the Congregationalists, Methodists and Presbyterians of the United States any longer stay apart? Dearly beloved brethren, there is no reason why there should be any divisions in Protestantism save stiff-necked spiritual pride. All the denominations, from "blue-nosed" Presbyterianism on the one hand to radical Unitarianism on the other, could combine tomorrow, if they cared a tenth as much for religion as they do for their own selfish aggrandisement and power. No interest of truth is anywhere being served by any one sect apart from other sects. It is a spiritual crime for any denomination to invade a community today and organize a new church of its own persuasion. One duty is before all churches today, and this is to *unite*, serving not Paul nor Apollos, but Christ! We congratulate the Congregationalists, Methodists and Presbyterians of Canada. They have done well. Let others go and do likewise!

Duty to Civilization

IX.

There may be large numbers of folk who believe that it is too late now to reopen the case of how the war originated, because the German Government has accepted the terms of indemnity imposed by Lloyd George and Briand. This would be taking a rather short-sighted view of the matter, though it would, of course, be in line with the procedure usually adopted. Such a course has, however, many drawbacks. In the first place it would leave nothing settled, and in the second it would most assuredly be a means of fostering a revanche party by the chauvinists in Germany. Then there is to be considered the attitude of the serious historian who will deal with this matter with cold impartial application, and leave no stone unturned that will disclose new facts. Already we hear from many lands that historians are at work on this job.

There are many institutions and periodicals in European countries that are giving information to the public that would utterly confound our leaders of thought if they read them. Take for instance the work done by the editors of *Foreign Affairs,* the English publication. It records regularly the findings of European investigators of repute, and produces the documents as they are gathered for examination. Besides there are the Union of Democratic Control, with its international branches, and the "Société d'etudes critigues et documentaires sur la guerre," to mention only two at work with headquarters in England and France. The truth will out no matter what some professors of political science in American universities may think of the expediency of it. These men will soon learn that they must put out of their minds all the chief points given to them by war-propagandists in the Official Entente case against Germany. The Potsdam Council did not take place; Mr. Fay, in his articles in the *American Historical Review,* has exposed that preposterous legend. They must also put out of their minds the idea that the ex-Kaiser deliberately planned this war, and that he and his Government instigated Austria in measures that would bring about European conflagration. Another notion put into their heads by the minions of "Crewe House" was that Britain went to war to defend the rights of small nations. That must go to limbo, and with it must go the notion that the war began when the Germans violated Belgian territory on August 4th, 1914; and every idea about the mobilization of the various armies, cultivated by the war-propagandists of the Entente Allies, must be rejected as utterly fallacious.

There will, notwithstanding the information that is now abroad as to the origins of this war, remain

in the minds of some professors of political science, all the stories wrought from the frenzied imagination of partisans, who after the war began retailing fictions which beat anything attributed to Baron Munchausen and de Rougemont. These "revelations" had, of course, nothing whatever to do with the origins of the war; still the case against Germany was, so far as the general public was concerned, largely based on them.

American leaders of thought must know that the Germans, in preparing for the struggle, did not place concrete foundations for their heavy guns in Belgium, the Pas de Calais, and Brixton. Mr. Buchan, the English official historian of the war, laid that yarn. There were no angels at Mons. The British nurse whose breasts were mutilated by German soldiers, according to the hallucination of her sister, was not on the continent at the time the alleged deed was done, and this was proved at the hearing of the case which took place before the Lord President of the Council at Edinborough. "Little Alf's postage stamp," which when removed disclosed the statement in writing that his tongue had been cut out, was another fiction run to earth by Canon Peter Green of Manchester Cathedral. The story of the crucified soldier was another figment of the imagination of some journalistic Munchausen, and was denied by General Marsh at Washington; yet, that yarn served its purpose as the basis of a war-propaganda drama, which had the blessing of Woodrow Wilson; and so on with 99 per cent of the particular atrocity sensations retailed in the press, and circulated by platform patriots. Of course, there are "Black and Tans" in every army, and this war was attended with as much military atrocity as any that ever took place. There is no denying that, but what has that got to do with its origin? Anyway, what is the good of the leaders of thought getting indignant about the artocities of the enemy army, while they overlook the atrocities perpetrated by other armies? It is difficult to catch the sound of protests that are rising from American leaders of thought at the atrocities that have been perpetrated since the armistice!

I do not hear the pulpits of the land ringing with denunciatory terms at what has taken place in Ireland, Rhineland, India, Egypt and Hayti. I cannot remember hearing very much from the American leaders of thought at what took place in South Africa and in the Philippines. Well, perhaps these things were not brought so vividly to their notice as the crucified soldier incident was. Were they really sincere in their complaints against the atrocities attributed to the enemy soldiers in this war? Frankly, they were not, for they, themselves, neither took the trouble to investigate the cases, nor would they tolerate such a course when undertaken by others.

The Bryce Commission was to them all embracing and final, yet the Bryce Commission did not deal with one single case of atrocity that was retailed for the purpose of inflaming the worst instincts of the people. When American leaders of thought reveal the desire to put an end to wars and all their atrocities, then the purpose of the Bryce Commission will have some value, and may be used as a means of saving mankind from the horrors of warfare.

British Radicals have a clear record as to this matter, as anyone who can remember their actions during the time of the Boer War can well understand. All through the period of this war, though their sensibilities were outraged over and over again by such incidents as the loss of the Lusitania, the sinking of hospital ships, and air raids over their country, they never lost sight of the fact that it was warfare that was going on. But, of course, they were raised in another school, and they were familiar with the notions of their own militarists. They knew quite well when the Lusitania, an Admiralty designed and Government subsidized vessel, carrying ammunition, was sunk, that it was done according to the tenets of Lord Fisher himself, who had the brutal courage to say, when he heard of the retirement of Admiral Tirpitz: "I'd have done the same myself, only our idiots in England wouldn't believe it when I told them." (See "Memories," p. 31.)

A few weeks before the war began, a controversy took place between Lord Sydenham and Admiral Sir Percy Scott on the use of the submarine against merchant vessels in war time. In a letter to the *Times* on July 16th, 1914, Admiral Sir Percy Scott cited this extract from a letter of a foreign naval officer: "If we went to war with an insular country depending for its food on supplies from overseas, it would be our business to stop that supply. On the declaration of war we would notify the enemy that she should warn those of her merchant ships coming home not to approach the island as we were establishing a blockade of mines and submarines. Similarly we should notify all neutrals that such a blockade had been established, and that if any of their vessels approached the island they would be liable to destruction, either by mines or submarines, and therefore would do so at their own risk." This is Sir Percy Scott's comment upon that forecast of future action: "Such a proclamation would, in my opinion, be perfectly in order, and once it had been made if any British or neutral ships disregarded it, they could not be held to be engaged in peaceful avocations, and if they were sunk in the attempt, it could not be described as a relapse into savagery or piracy in its blackest form."

Moreover, it should not be forgotten that it was Lord Fisher, himself, who says that he made a memorandum in 1902, when he was Commander of the Mediterranean Fleet, that "for a purpose unnecessary to be detailed here, it is absolutely obligatory for us to have 'offensive floating mines' instantly for war against Germany." ("Records," page 223.)

There is indeed not one matter of consequence that has been raised by the war-propagandists in connection with the conduct of this war that has not been considered over and over again, long indeed before American leaders of thought became immersed in the way in which German militarists were said to have conducted this war. Consider all those points that were raised in connection with the conduct of the military authorities of the German army in Belgium, and how Professor, now Brigadier General, John Morgan, in his work, "The German War Book," gave a lead to Entente leaders of thought in holding up the authors of German military law; the men, by the way, that Lord Haldane accepted as guides in his work of preparing the British Expeditionary Force, as horrible examples of barbarians. Perhaps it is not known to some professors of political science that there is little or no difference to be found in the British War Book, "The Laws and Usages of War," and the German "Kriegsbuch." I should like to quote from an article which appeared in the *London New Age,* May 20th, 1915, called "Advocatus Diaboli—The Policy of 'Moral Indignation,'" by C. H. Norman, an English radical. This is what he says:

> "As with the British moral indignation about Germany's breeches of international law, so it is with the bitter complaints of German military methods; there is equally little substance in the criticisms. In reading through The Laws and Usages of War, published by the British War Office in 1914, one is struck with its similarity to the German Kriegsbuch, in the clauses dealing with the Occupation of Enemy Territory. The following sections are from The Manual of Military Law, published by the British War Office in 1914: (357) The occupant can claim certain services from the inhabitants, and may impose upon them such restricttions as he judges necessary. He can, under certain conditions, use, requisition, seize and destroy their property, and they may, in various other ways, have to suffer under the effects of the war. (362) Political laws and constitutional privileges are, as a matter of course, suspended during occupation; for instance, the laws affecting recruitment, those concerning suffrage, the right of assembly, the right to bear arms, and the freedom of the press. (370) The inhabitants of occupied territory expose themselves to the punishments for war treason in case they contribute to funds which enable their legitimate government to prosecute the war. (372 and 423) The occupant may raise money by contribution. Cash, over and above taxes, may be requisitioned from the inhabitants and is then called a 'contribution.' (378) Public worship must be permitted and religious convictions respected. If the salaries of the clergy are paid by the State they must be continued. The clergy must refrain from reference to politics, and if they use their position to incite the population to resistance or revolt, they may be dealt with as war criminals. When one recollects the uproar there was in this country because Cardinal Mercier was placed under detention in consequence of his pastoral to the Belgian people, one is surprised that so many prominent politicians, who must have known the military rule on this subject, should have lent themselves to that absurd demonstration. The Cardinal was dealt with somewhat leniently from the British militarist standard. (386) If, contrary to the duty of the inhabitants to remain peaceful, hostile acts are committed by individual inhabitants, a belligerent is justified in requiring the aid of the population to prevent their recurrence and, in serious and urgent cases, in resorting to reprisals. (414) The custom of war permits as an act of reprisals the destruction of a house by burning or otherwise, whose inmates, without possessing the rights of combatants, have fired on the troops. (458) Although collective punishment of the population is forbidden for the acts of individuals for which it cannot be regarded as collectively responsible, it may be necessary to resort to reprisals against a locality or community for some act committed by its inhabitants or members who cannot be identified. In a footnote the editors give this interesting example of the futility of certain kinds of reprisals re prisoners: 'In 1813, the British Government having sent to England to be tried for treason twenty-three Irishmen naturalized in the United States, who had been captured on vessels of the United States, Congress authorized the President to retaliate. Under this act, General Dearborn placed in close confinement twenty-three prisoners taken at Fort George. General Prevost, under the express direction of Lord Bathurst, ordered the close imprisonment of double the number of commissioned and non-commissioned United States officers. This was followed by a "threat of unmitigated severity against American citizens and villages" in case the system of retaliation was pursued. Mr. Madison

retaliated by putting into confinement a similar number of British officers taken by the United States. General Prevost immediately retaliated by subjecting to the same discipline all his prisoners. A better temper, however, soon came over the British Government, by whom the system had been instituted, and the prisoners were released on both sides.' Perhaps Mr. Winston Churchill and Mr. Asquith will study that incident in regard to the fatuity of the differential treatment of submarine prisoners of war.

"A second example of reprisals is thus stated in a footnote by the editor: 'In his proclamations of May 31, June 16, and June 19, 1900, Field Marshal Lord Roberts threatened reprisals for wanton damage to property and damage to railway and telegraph lines by the burning of the houses and farms in the vicinity of the places where the damage was done.' In a pamphlet on The War in South Africa (1900) and How It Is Being Carried On, signed An Officer in the Field, some of these orders are set out: (1) If occupants of farms are disloyal, or have fathers and sons still serving against us, the cattle and stock are to be seized without payment or receipts. (2) While giving protection to loyal inhabitants in his district the general officer commanding will see that the country is so denuded of forage and supplies that no means of subsistence is left for any commands attempting to make incursions. Another proclamation ran thus: (1) The principal residents of the towns and districts are to be held jointly and severally responsible for the amount of damage done in their district. (2) Heavy fines are to be inflicted and the receipts for all goods taken by the troops to be cancelled. (3) The principal residents may be forced to travel on the trains. (4) The houses and farms in the vicinity of the places where the damage is done are to be destroyed, and the residents in the neighborhood dealt with according to martial law. The consequence of this sort of conduct was put thus by the writer of the pamphlet: In England, people are astonished at the mobility which enables DeWet to defy all the efforts of our generals; but they would cease to wonder if, for instance, they could see the march of a column of the Imperial Light Horse, with its endless array of wagons and vehicles of all sorts, piled up with the contents of Boer houses, beds, chairs, tables, all things that can be removed are carried away, and not by this corps alone, but Canadians, New Zealanders, Yeomanry; all pursue the same game. Such proceedings are a sad commentary on the Peace Conference at the Hague. The writer then describes the effect of this warfare upon the Boer women: Some went to Kaffir huts to beg from their former servants; some came to the camps supplicants for food. When women live on the charity of a camp, it is needless to describe to what depths of infamy necessity soon reduces them. . . . That we should force the surrender of our enemies by starving their children and degrading their wives and daughters is surely a barbarity that no European nations would be guilty of at the end of the nineteenth century of the Christian era. So the Germans have some way to travel still upon the road marked out by some British militarists! The conclusion of this pamphlet is rather sinister, in its warning note, in view of the present critical state of Europe: 'I am convinced that ruthless destruction of property and the deliberate exposure of women and children to horrors worse than those of the battlefield will draw sooner or later the vengeance of God on the perpetrators. An Empire built on such deeds cannot last, and we may well tremble to think that an emissary may soon be selected from among the nations to devastate as an avenging angel the homes of England.'

"To continue the extracts from the Handbook of Military Law: (434) General devastation of enemy territory is, as a rule, absolutely prohibited, and only permitted very exceptionally when it is imperatively demanded by the necessities of war. The question in what circumstances a necessity arises cannot be decided by any hard and fast rule. For instance, in the case of a levee en masse on already occupied territory, when self-preservation compels a belligerent to resort to the most severe measures, a general devastation might be absolutely necessary. (408) No damage may be done that is not required by military operations, but even total destruction of property is justifiable if it is required by the exigencies of war. (392) Services for legitimate purposes may, if necessary, be obtained by force, and the refusal to work may be met by punishment. (411) Neither can rent be claimed for the use of property, nor compensation for damage caused by the necessities of war. (437) As war is the last remedy of Governments for injuries, no means would appear to exist for enforcing reparation for violations of the laws of war. Which certainly sounds good sense! (450) All war crimes are liable to be punished by death, but a more lenient penalty may be pronounced. (462) Use has, in recent times, been made of hostages by placing prominent inhabitants on the engines of trains, on the lines of communication in occupied territory for the purpose of ensuring

the traffic from interruption by the native population.

"Two other clauses which are curiously interesting, in view of certain occurrences during the present war, are Nos. 33 and 38: (33) Should some inhabitants of a locality take part in the defence, it might be justifiable to treat all the males of a military age as prisoners of war. (38) Troops formed of colored individuals belonging to savage tribes and barbarous races should not be employed in a war between civilized States. The enrolling, however, of individuals belonging to the civilized colored races and the employment of whole regiments of disciplined colored soldiers is not forbidden. The Austrian Red Book on the atrocities of the Allies complains bitterly of the breach of the first part of No. 38 in the employment of the Gurkhas and the Turcos. No doubt Britain and France would defend their enrollment under the second part of No. 38; but the Gurkhas and the Turcos could hardly be described as civilized races as the practice of both is that of mutilation. However, enough has been quoted to indicate that the practical differences between German militarism and British militarism are somewhat difficult to detect. It is always the custom in war to accuse the other side of atrocities and infractions of the rules of the game; but it looks as though this were done to embitter the confiding civilians of the various belligerent States."

The way the "moral indignation" crew wrote and talked about the enemy in this war must have impressed a great many people with the idea that war had never been waged before. It was rather amazing to find how so many English liberals, who in less than twenty years had forgotten the incidents of the South African War, which had filled them with loathing; it is difficult to account for that extraordinary change affront in men who supported Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, when he denounced the British Government as conducting the war against the Boers with "methods of barbarism."

Can anyone read the pages of General Christiann Rudolf DeWet's "Three Years War" (Scribners), or Sir Francis Vane's "Pax Britannica," and believe that any decent-minded English speaking citizen could be a party to the propaganda campaigns set in motion during this war for the sole purpose of confusing the issue and traducing the enemy? Yet, numbers did it, and now when the truth is known, I am sorry to say, there are numbers who are not ashamed of their actions. When one's duty to civilization leads in the direction of making war worse than it is for the sake of stimulating patriotism to the point of hysteria, then it is time for some one to reconsider the meaning of the word "duty" and find another definition for the term "civilization."

I can, however, respect the action of a man who, without humbug, announces courageously that he supports his country right or wrong. I can understand such a person, but I cannot for the life of me understand a person who works up his moral indignation to a frenzy against the enemy's war, and takes no steps to denounce his country's war. Was it not Charles Gide, the well known French economist and jurist, who said: "It is the duty of every man living on this earth to weigh in a just balance the responsibility for this frightful massacre, to rise above his sympathies and his interests." I would commend this appeal to American leaders of thought, who, loathing war in the abstract, never took the trouble during the war to test the authenticity of the evidence supplied by the official war-propagandists.

Can any useful purpose be served by reopening the question of who was responsible for the war? I admit it is difficult to impress people with the necessity of doing this, for men as a rule do not like to admit that they have been humbugged, that they have lent their support to something that was not right. Furthermore, vast numbers of people are sick to death of the war, and do not want to learn anything more about it. They have lost so much physically, mentally and spiritually that they are only too glad to turn their attention in other directions. I recognize all this, but there is Europe, and the European political system remains, and so long as it remains the peace of the world is in danger.

Secret diplomacy was more rampant during the war than at any time that preceded it, and since the Armistice secret diplomacy has over and over again been the cause of nearly setting the Allies on one another's throats. Moreover, armaments today are a far greater burden to the peoples of France, Great Britain and America than they were at the time of the outbreak of the war. Then it did seem to some people that the time would shortly come when the peoples of Europe would demand disarmament, but now the making of armaments as a business has drawn in tens of thousands of workmen, whose livelihood depends upon the maintenance of the system, and therefore the question is just that much harder to deal with.

Both Gladstone and Bismarck said that the wresting of Alsace and Lorraine from France in 1870 would be the cause of another war. Gladstone said: "I have an apprehension that this violent laceration and transfer is to lead us from bad to worse, and to be the beginning of a new series of complications." Lord Lyons, the British Ambassador at Paris, recorded an opinion of Thiers, who, after a visit in 1870 to the Prussian headquarters, found "that there

was a political party and a military party, each clearly defined. The political party, with which Count Bismarck himself in a great measure agreed, was desirous of bringing the war to an end by concluding peace on comparatively moderate terms. The military party held that the glory of the Prussian arms and the future security of Germany demanded that the rights of war should be pushed to the uttermost, and that France should be laid waste, ruined and humiliated to such a degree as to render it impossible for her to wage war again with Germany for very many years." It was the military party in Prussia that was responsible for the peace terms in 1870.

The military party of the Entente Allies was responsible for the peace terms exacted after the armistice. Now, if the peace of 1870 was a danger to Europe, what sort of a danger to the world is the peace of Paris? Is there a man so purblind as to dream of the utter annihilation of chauvinism in all shape and form in Germany and Austria? He must be a particularly sanguine citizen who can rest content with such an idea, so long as the peace of Paris is based on the idea that Germany was wholly responsible for the war. The only way another European conflagration, or indeed a world conflagration can be averted, is by facing the ugly facts which confront us in connection with the origins of this war, and admit, like men who desire to live in peace and amity, that we were wrong where we were wrong, and that an entirely new peace should be made. That is the first step towards destroying the European political system, and it is futile for anyone to think that progressive steps can be taken in the direction of disarmament and the avoidance of wars in the future until this step has been taken.

FRANCIS NEILSON.

The End.

WHEN ALL IS DONE.

When all is done, and my last word is said,
And ye who loved me murmur, "He is dead,"
Let no one weep, for fear that I should know,
And sorrow too that ye should sorrow so.

When all is done and in the oozing clay
Ye lay this cast-off hull of mine away,
Pray not for me, for after long despair
The quiet of the grave will be a prayer.

For I have suffered loss and grievous pain,
The hurts of hatred and the world's disdain,
And wounds so deep that love, well-tried and pure,
Had not the power to ease them or to cure.

When all is done, say not my day is o'er,
And that through night I seek a dimmer shore;
Say rather that my morn has just begun,—
I greet the dawn and not a setting sun,
When all is done.

—*Paul Laurence Dunbar.*

CONTRIBUTED

Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature

X.

WALT WHITMAN.

Walter Whitman, 1819-1892, was the most expressive and representative of Americans, and the most democratic of poets the world has known. Born of American blood, with an admixture of Dutch (Holland), in early life a farmer, teacher, carpenter, and printer, he early devoted himself to writing the epic of democracy, which grew from a small volume to a large one in his "Leaves of Grass." In a new form of poetic expression—original, rough, incisive, impressive—he spoke to the people boldly, directly out of his mind and heart, of what he had seen and lived, interpreting America more truthfully than any other has done. He was undoubtedly the greatest personality—the most virile, the most cosmopolitan, of the broadest and sanest intellect, withal the most sympathetic and human—that America has as yet produced.

John Burroughs said that Whitman's "Leaves of Grass"

> certainly radiates democracy as no other modern literary work does, and brings the reader into intimate and enlarged relations with fundamental human qualities—with sex, manly love, charity, faith, self-esteem, candor, purity of body, sanity of mind. He was democratic because he was not in any way separated from the common people by his quality, his culture, or his aspirations. He was bone of their bone, and flesh of their flesh.

W. J. Fox asserted of "Leaves of Grass" that it gives

> a clearer conception of what manly modesty really is than anything we have in all conventional forms of word, deed or act so far known of. It will in time become a pregnant text-book, from which quotations as sterling as the minted gold will be taken and applied to every form of the outer and inner life.

Basil de Selincourt says that Whitman rises above nationality and becomes a universal figure; poet of the ever-beckoning future, the ever-expanding, ever-insatiable spirit of man. Lombroso declared that Whitman's poetry bears the imprint of a strange and wild originality. Edward Dowden remarks that this poetry takes whatever shape it possesses directly from the soul of the maker. Havelock Ellis declares that Whitman has taken his place by the side of the world's greatest moral teachers, beside Jesus and Socrates. Edward Carpenter says of Whitman's writtings that

> there every nationality, every creed, every trade, every action of humanity is represented, and all fused in the great loving soul that overbroods them.

In order to do justice to Whitman it is necessary to recognize his philosophical point of view. He was not a philosopher, but he was much influenced by Emerson and Thoreau, as well as other transcendentalists of New England. He knew something of Hegel and the other German thinkers, and early imbibed some of their ideas. None of these philosophers probably had as much influence over his thinking as did his training in the Quaker church, to which his family belonged. He heard Elias Hicks when he was a boy, and he wrote of him in his old age with admiration. The Quaker emphasis on an inner light, the immediate contact of the individual soul with God, had its effect

on Whitman. This may have led to his emphasis on individual freedom and initiative, his distrust of all formal religion and churchly institutions, his invigorating self-reliance, and his mystical trend of mind. From Emerson, and the other transcendentalists, he inbibed his conception of an impersonal God, his reliance on intuition as the guide of the individual life, and his attitude of trust in nature and the universe. From Hegel may have come his idea that the universe is one ever-proceeding cosmic process, revealed not only in consciousness, but also in the mystic processes of the unconscious.

These influences helped to shape for Whitman his idea that the universe is fundamentally one in its processes, that it is primarily good, that evil is good in the making, and that there is no satanic power working against God. Every phase of the world and of life was to Whitman a manifestation of the cosmic process, a direct revelation of God, and therefore at the bottom good in its nature. No part of man's life is to be regarded as vile in itself, and is only so because of its base uses. The recognition of this conception of his is necessary in order to comprehend what he wrote in those poems which he named "Children of Adam," in which he deals with sex with great plainness of speech. Even what here seems gross and revolting was to him a part of man and nature, in themselves good, because a part of the great revelation of God. He believed that nothing is vile and unclean except as we pervert it with our base thought and interpretation. The reproduction of the race seemed to him a beautiful and a noble process, not to be regarded with contempt, but to be spoken of with clean lips and unperverted mind. What is hidden from sight, what is regarded as too vile for speech, what is looked upon as base and ignoble, becomes such from the very manner in which it is treated. Evil speech is for him who evil thinks, and nothing is unclean unless we choose to make it such.

This unitary conception of the cosmic process, which includes all that man is in the wholeness of his nature, is most characteristic of Whitman's thinking, as expressed in all that he wrote. His mind was not perverted and gross, and there is no evidence that he lived a life of passion and sensuality, as some have thought. He revered every phase of nature, spoke of it in plainest terms, would not accept what is natural as base and degraded, and therefore saw no evil in describing it as a part of what the cosmic process demands for the good of the individual and the race.

The poetry, the philosophy, the religion, and the political ideals of Walt Whitman may be expressed in the one word, Democracy. He was convincedly and uncompromisingly a democrat, one who believed in and trusted the people, even the common folk who labor with their hands, and are not wise with the wisdom of the schools. He thoroughly believed in the principle of equality, that none are to be regarded in the political sense as superior to others, that all are to stand on the same level. He knew many persons who were learned and wise, many also who were in high social positions; but he made no distinction between these and the men who toil with their hands and have no social standing whatever. He had nothing whatever of Ruskin's aristocratic tastes and preferences. He saw behind all these artificial distinctions, and accepted the man for his individuality, his capacity for growth, his qualities of mind and heart, and as having a soul that is open to all which is noble and true.

As a democrat and a transcendentalist, Whitman placed great emphasis on personality, the nature of the self, and its intrinsic uniqueness. He believed in "the simple separate person," that each individual is unlike all other individuals, that he is in himself a cosmos. He held to the unitary nature of the individual, that body and mind are essentially one, that the mind is in no sense or degree better than the body, that together they constitute the integrity of the person. Whitman in his poetry seems to be supremest of egotists, speaking only of himself, and what he desires and is. It is to be recognized, however, that Whitman's egoism has at its basis supreme confidence in God, who speaks to and through his individuality. If he asserts, as he does, that he is as good as God, that God is no other than himself, it is because he sees clearly his relations to the cosmic order, that as a part of that order he is one with God, and that the Infinite Self speaks to and in his individual self. His personal self is also the self of humanity as a whole.

As one of the most pronounced of democrats the world has known, Whitman was of the opinion that the doctrine of personality, and of individual rights, must be applied to women in every particular as to men. In judging of his poems relating to sex this fact must be taken into the fullest consideration. In no sense did he regard women as of an inferior nature or to be held in any form or degree of subjection. Always and everywhere are they the equals of men, to be treated with the same reverence and consideration, to be given the same freedom and opportunities, and in all respects to be the masters of their own bodies and minds. In all relations of man and woman, whether in the family, in the state, or in the realms of morality and religion, the two should stand to each other on a basis of absolute equality. They are to be friends, comrades, close companions, each reliant on the other, both alike ready to make sacrifices for the common good, neither in any sense to dictate the conduct of the other. In such companionship sex becomes one of the most effective and powerful of all aids to individual and social advancement.

Not only did Whitman insist that there should be a genuine comradeship and equality between men and women; but he was emphatically a teacher of a vigorous friendship between men as men. As an individualist he emphasized in the most impressive manner the worth of personality; but he at the same time desired that men should associate together for their mutual advantage, and that human society might become more worthy in all respects. His democracy was workable only if men were kindly disposed towards each other, if they worked together as friends, and if they sought each other's welfare as devoted comrades. Fellowship meant as much to him as it did to William Morris, who said that its presence was heaven, while its absence was hell. Not the less emphatically did Whitman think that loving devotion of men to each other was the best manner in which society could be improved and the state made effective as an institution. Devotion of men to each other individually, serving each other loyally, with a love that is akin to self-sacrifice, was what Whitman regarded as the means of social progress. His emphasis on comradeship was not less than his assertion of individuality and self-reliance. To his mind the two belong together as do the body and the mind. They are not

only inseparable, but they are one in essence, one in their processes of operation. Self-reliance can be developed only in connection with that loyalty to others in which character is asserted and the progress of the race secured.

Whitman says of that section of his "Leaves of Grass" which he called "Calamus," that in it he desired to express the "never-satisfied appetite for sympathy and the boundless offering of sympathy, the universal democratic comradeship, the old, eternal, yet ever-new interchange of adhesiveness, so fitly emblematic of America." The states composing the American Union were and are bound together by such ties of friendship, each free and independent in itself, controlling all its own affairs as if it stood quite alone; and yet all bound together by the closest ties of mutual dependence and protection. In this manner is formed a fellowship of human communities, making a great federal union, which has been justified by the fact that it has come to be the most powerful nation in the world. Whitman never tires of praising this form of social and national fellowship. To his mind such a fellowship should bind human beings to each other in an indissoluble union, based on the complete independence and initiative of the single individuals. Each of these individuals is capable of self-reliance, freedom of action, and freedom of thought. At the same time, the law of fellowship attracts him to others, not by any compulsion from without, not by any authority of the state; but because of fellow-sympathy with others, attraction for them and for what they can give of their individuality in friendship. A free, spontaneous attraction of men to each other, a spirit of mutual love and service, this it is that perfects and fully rounds out the individuality.

It was in the expression of such ideas as these that Whitman wrought out the peculiar form of poetry in which he produced his "Leaves of Grass." His opinion was that American democracy demanded a new kind of literary expression, one that would truly reflect and interpret its character. What has come to be called "free verse," which has in some considerable degree discarded the old poetical forms and methods of expression, owes its origin to him, and it has been adopted by some of the poets in several countries. To him it seemed that rhyme and rhythm limited the poet, did not give him sufficient freedom and flexibility of utterance, was too conventional and restrictive for the poet who would measure up his utterances to the breadth and the greatness of American democracy. Sometimes he wrote the merest prose, and again, and for the greater part, he wrote with a vigor, an incisiveness, a poetical swing and power reached by no other American poet.

Those who have read Whitman's prose, as in his introductions to the several editions of his poems, and in his "Democratic Vistas," have realized that he had command of a vigorous manner of utterance, somewhat crabbed and unpolished, perhaps, but impressive, vigorous, and masterful. Democracy, he assures us, "can never prove itself beyond cavil, until it founds and luxuriantly grows its own forms of art, poems, schools, theology, displacing all that exists or that has been produced anywhere in the past, under opposite influences." Pertinent to the present is his assertion that "the problem of humanity all over the civilized world is social and religious, and is to be finally met and treated by literature. The priest departs, the divine literatus comes." In these words he sufficiently indicates why he cultivated a style and form of utterance quite his own, both in prose and poetry. He appealed to the people, he wished to interpret democracy, he desired that America should speak for herself and in tones distinctly her own.

These quotations might indicate that Whitman had the same kind of distrust of the past as was characteristic of Ibsen; but this would be far from the truth. He did have great confidence in the future, and he was one who lived in the present and for its values. At the same time he had a large interest in the past, and linked it with the present in one continuous evolutionary process. It was greatly characteristic of Whitman that he accepted science with a large confidence, and he embraced whole-heartedly its method and its conclusions. As in the instance of no other poet, he was in fullest sympathy with modern science, and its great affirmations were the vertebræ of his poetry. It was to him a revelation, the spoken word of God to our time. His conception of the cosmos was not a merely idealistic one, or one expressing poetical conceptions only; but it had the force and strength of science, as well as its largeness of vision and its magnitude of comprehension.

It remains to say a word of Whitman's religion. He revolted against theology, churchly forms, the creeds and rituals commonly accepted; but he was profoundly religious in his own manner. He had a large and comprehensive faith in God, and expresses that faith often and strongly. His God was rather pantheistic than theistic, human much more than autocratic, in the cosmic order and by no means outside it. Nevertheless, this faith of his had a large place in his life, not in church attendance or utterance of prayers; but in uprightness and nobleness of life, in loving communion with nature, in loyal sympathy with his human fellows, and in an abiding trust in the forces that make for the progress of mankind. He said in his poetry that we were never religious enough, that religion is at the basis of life, that in trust and faith are the inspirations of morality and conduct.

The kind of religion in which Whitman believed, and which he practiced all his life, is that which sent him into the Washington hospitals during the Civil War, to care for and to console the thousands of wounded he found there. He was not a professional nurse, he was not paid for his services, and he was sent to this work by no association whatever. He found that the young men there needed a friend, a sympathetic word, a kindly hand pressure and smile; and these he gave to all alike, according to their need. In his letters to his mother, published as "The Wound Dresser," he tells most intimately the story from week to week of this service, what it meant to him, and what it meant to the soldiers who had no other friend perhaps who came to them as a brother and comrade. No other story of the war was more pathetic, more self-sacrificing, with a larger appeal to the emotions, than this told by Whitman in his letters. Nothing Whitman wrote gives the inner meanings of his religion more truly and more comprehensively than in these hastily written and by no means literary outpourings of his heart and his mind.

This religion of Whitman's was not one only of fellow-feeling and sympathy; but it had a cosmic outlook and power. Lacking in system and an orderly philosophical interpretation, it was large, robust, manly,

and comprehensive. It had the proportions of the universe, and the tenderness of a mother brooding over her babe. There was in it no phrasing of old traditions, no mumbling of oft-repeated rituals, and no acceptance of age-old words that have lost their meaning. Nothing was said because it sounded piously or had the tone of devotion. This religion of Whitman's was virile, outspoken, radical, fearless, free as the winds that blow. Here was a religion that belongs to all peoples, that speaks all languages, that is as large as humanity. In a word, it was simply and assuredly human, human with all that makes humanity what it is. There was in it also the greatest confidence in the continuity of man's life, that immortality belongs to the human soul, now and forever.

John Addington Symonds, in his book on Whitman, and at the end of the chapter on religion, gives a most earnest testimony to what this religion had been to him in his hours of serious illness and almost complete failure of the forces of life:

"For my part," wrote Symonds, "I may confess that it shone upon me when my life was broken, when I was weak, sickly, poor and of no account; and that I have ever lived thenceforward in the light and warmth of it. . . . During my darkest hours it comforted me with the conviction that I too played my part in the illimitable symphony of cosmic life. When I sinned, sorrowed, suffered, it touched me with a gentle hand of sympathy and understanding, sustained me with a strong arm of assurance that in the end I could not go amiss (for I was part, an integrating part of the great whole); and when strength revived in me it stirred a healthy pride and courage to effectuate myself, to bear the brunt of spiritual foes, the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune."

GEORGE WILLIS COOKE.

The Silent Suffering of the Old in Germany

In the city of Dresden, formerly so well-beloved by the American tourist, I sat recently in the office of the American Friends Service Committee which, through the courtesy of the present government of Saxony, occupies rooms on the ground floor of the former royal palace. I was waiting to be taken to the yard of a school-house in an old part of the city to see a thousand children and nursing mothers stream in to receive the daily supplementary meal of nourishing food —warm cocoa or sweet milk, rice or bean-soup and "broetchen"—which, through the generosity of thousands of Americans whose imaginative sympathy has not been shrivelled and killed by the propaganda blasts and hatred hurricanes of the war, the Quaker organization is daily supplying to over nine hundred thousand children throughout the republic.

As I waited the door opened slowly and an old lady walked in. She found a seat near the door and asked to see "the American." She was frail and pale, with white hair and faded cheeks, and she wore a threadbare jacket and a skirt that had long since passed its prime. Because everyone else was busy I undertook to understand her German and to receive her story.

She said that she was eighty years old and that with twenty-four other ladies she lived in a private home, the "Stift Wilhelma," in Weinhoehla bei Dresden. Some years ago they had all paid for their admission to the home, thinking that it would provide security and comfort for the remaining years of their lives. But the war had come and, following it, the costs of everything had so increased and the value of money had so depreciated that the income of the investment which was formerly adequate to maintain the Home had become totally insufficient to provide heat in winter, or ice in summer, or butter or milk, or any of the luxuries which Americans regard as daily necessities of civilized existence. In short, these old women, homeless and friendless, were slowly starving of hunger and despair and she had come to ask for food,—not so much for herself as for the others who were too old to come.

What could I say? Our funds are not only limited to the feeding of children but they are insufficient to meet more than sixty percent of the need of that section of the distressed population of Germany.

One could turn the old lady out with this explanation, which was no explanation to her, but one could not turn one's heart into a stone nor forget the pitiful appeal in the tired grey eyes as she turned to go. Surely there are people, kind people, somewhere who would and could relieve the situation if they only knew! If they only knew!

Berlin. BRENT DOW ALLINSON.
Friends Service Committee.

CORRESPONDENCE

A Proposed Amendment to the Constitution

To the Editor of UNITY:

You ask for consideration of a proposed amendment to the constitution of the United States, printed in your issue of July 21. It seems to me that the framers of this proposition fail rightly to distinguish between their ideal of a better world to be won by the normal processes of enlightenment and by the daily working of the free spirit, and a rigid set of rules to be obtained by majorities and enforced by the strong arm of a government and presently crystallized into the legalisms of a regime of force. I think that nothing is ever attained by man, or can ever be really his, which is not his from within, and by his own choice or will. It is extraordinary to observe the sway of the fashion just now, when anyone catches a vision of some desirable object, to proceed straightway to hustle together a majority of votes in its favor, and to compel the minority to obey, and, distrusting the future, to write it into the constitution of government, so as to forbid, if possible, any alteration. But this is not good democracy; it is a species of veiled despotism, that is, of will exercising power and ready to use violence in fighting and overthrowing other wills. Good democracy surely ought to be understood as the general and co-operative will, and therefore the exercise of good will. Is it not for this reason, that the best democrats have always prescribed the least possible government, meaning by this the fewest cast-iron rules and the least rigidity of "government," in the sense of an assumed control by one part of the people (whether large or small) over the conduct of the others?

There is another extraordinary fact to be noted in the efforts of kindly people who desire a better world. While various demands are crowded together in the proposed Amendment XX, which seem to me quite beyond the wisdom of any legislature or congress in existence, there is one vast piece of injustice inherent in our system of land tenure, upon which the largest part of unearned wealth now rests. The nature of this injustice is easily obvious and persua-

sive. I can see no need of elaborate constitutional amendments for the wholesome work of reform. Release the poor man, and everyone else, from the double tax—to landlords for an unearned rental, and also to the State for our community undertakings—give freedom of movement to unused land and the resources which it covers, and then see what will happen. See if the evils which are confused together under the forbidding name of "capitalism" do not slough away, as when you have relieved a limb from a tightening pinch, swelling and soreness disappear. Now I call it extraordinary that people who seek human betterment will insist upon complicated programs which they expect legislators (as now assembled, the most unfit among all citizens) to straighten out and enact into laws for them, and not care enough to take a hand in the removal of a very great injustice right at their doors, for the continuance of which every citizen is responsible, and which once fairly settled would open clearer vision of whatever further works of betterment need to be carried out.

July 30, 1921. CHARLES F. DOLE.

Significance of British Navalism and Disarmament Conference

To the Editor of UNITY:

The Christian Science Monitor, the mouthpiece of British opinion in America, in its issue of July 28, 1921, publishes an article, "Dominion Navies as Police of the Seas," sent from London. This article gives opinion of various British statesmen regarding British foreign and naval policies.

"Sir Samuel Hoare, who has made a special study of foreign affairs, maintained that Anglo-American friendship must be the basis of the common policy of the Empire. On the question of the Anglo-Japanese alliance he was equally emphatic, but he urged it should be modified as far as possible to meet the just demands of China, and to meet American views. Mr. McLean (Labor Party) said that the Labor Party welcomed the invitation to dominion premiers to hammer out a common policy for the British Empire, not as an end, but as a means to an end. That is to say, he would have not only a common understanding between the states under the British flag, but between all English speaking peoples.

"General Townsend . . . would have the Australian fleet policing the Pacific and China Seas; the Canadian fleet policing the North Atlantic and Caribbean; the Indian fleet policing the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf and Red Sea, as under the name of the Royal Indian Marine, as it did so honorably for over two centuries up to 1850. . . . The British navy would then be concentrated in home waters ready to move to any theater which was threatened in war time. . . . "

The scheme is rather ambitious and makes us all stop and think. The only comment necessary is that the plan does not give the whole of the British plan of the control of the seas. At the present the Baltic is made a British lake and the Mediterranean is also a British lake through the control of Gibraltar, Suez, Malta, and Constantinople, Cyprus, etc. Moreover the scheme is certainly ambitious when we see that the Canadian navy is going to police the North Atlantic and the Caribbean and the Australian navy to police the Pacific and the China Seas and the British navy is to come to the rescue of the newly created great navies of the British States, at the time of war. With this scheme—supposedly consistent with the ideal of the union of the English speaking people as now being advocated by the British statesmen—they expect the American navy to co-operate with the British navy for the sake of the English speaking union, which means practically the control of the sea routes of the world under the leadership of the British navy through the program of the Anglo-American Union.

Is this the real reason of the Disarmament Conference to be held in Washington?

TARAKNATH DAS.

309 *Washington Street, Boston, Mass.*

Regeneration

To the Editor of UNITY:

Disarmament, once again a catchword, has loomed up on the horizon of popular phrases.

The public, always eager for that which is new, be it a novelty in attire, a novelty in a food product, be it a new hair cut or a new religion, snatches also at a new idea. It does not apply itself conscientiously to the task of determining on the sound basis of reason whether the innovation is an advantage to be encouraged or a disadvantage to be shunned. The average individual feels safe in standing on the ground with the majority. The most popular idea of the present day is disarmament.

Peace societies and disarmament—will they succeed in liberating mankind from the curse of war? Will they succeed in establishing on earth a reign of friendly relations among the peoples? Not if disarmament means the reduction of arms and nothing else. Not if peace societies limit their activities to discussions on blessings of peace.

To establish peace mankind must mercilessly shatter the idols at whose shrines it is worshiping. The world is enslaved by the grossest materialism. The greed for gold is the controlling impulse. The comfort which it buys the highest goal.

As long as mankind is governed by greed and by selfishness, there will be wars. As long as the acquirement of wealth is the paramount purpose of our existence, wars will inevitably result. As long as the world is mad for a low order of distraction which it calls pleasure, wars will exist. Arms reduced may easily be changed to arms increased. Peace treaties may easily be broken. There remains but one issue. The individual must change. He must substitute a new purpose as his aim in life. He must learn to annul self. He must accept as a paramount object of his life the obligation to others. He must give expression to a more esthetic, a more intellectual, a more spiritual form of pleasure. When this is accomplished we may hope for a period of peace on earth, good will to men. FRIDA M. SPIERING.

The foreign policy of the Government regulates our international relations; and diplomacy is the instrument used by the Foreign Secretary (or Secretary of State) to conduct negotiations for the adjustment of differences and the settlement of disputes. Is it desirable that the people should be entirely excluded from any sort of participation in this branch of government?

—*Arthur Ponsonby.*

THE FIELD.

THE UNION OF EAST AND WEST.

With the present-day awakening of the civilized world for unity and brotherhood, one thing is certain: The East must know the West and the West must know the East. No thoughtful person can fail to see that in sympathetic co-operation among the nations lie the germs of a gloriously new evolution for men. The Past with its experience bitter and bright, the Present with its gigantic progress, the East with its eager searching into the mysteries of soul, the West with its gigantic conquest of the forces of nature, all stand face to face today ready to give and take the hand of Fellowship.

The improved facilities of communication have brought peoples of far distant lands closer than ever before. The time might come with the progress of science when the barriers of distance will completely vanish, and the geographical boundaries will be mere names. Then the world will be like a full-blown flower, with nations as petals, each distinct from the other, with a separate existence and a special mission to fulfill, but all will be united at the stem of humanity by the bond of love.

To harmonize the opinions which nations and races hold of each other is the first step towards assuring universal peace, and the gulf between race and race and nation and nation can only be bridged by knowledge, understanding and sympathy.

The mutual appreciation of literature, arts and ideals of the East and the West will help to bring the day when "peace and good will" reign supreme on earth. Walt Whitman, the seer-bard of America, saw that there was "going to be one heart to the universe" and there is a call today for you and me to contribute each our little quota towards this laudable and beneficent end.

Object: The aim of the society is to establish a meeting place for the East and the West in the field of Art, Literature, Music, Drama, Science and Philosophy with a view to promote good fellowship and better understanding among all peoples. (Political and religious controversies are excluded.)

Methods: To further the above object the Society proposes:

1. To hold social gatherings and conversaziones for friendly intercourse.
2. To give dramatic readings and recitals.
3. To arrange lectures, discussions and debates.
4. To publish literature.
5. To promote exhibitions of arts and industries.
6. To arrange Scientific Demonstrations.
7. To organize dramatic performances.

Subscriptions: An Annual Subscription of a member is Ten Dollars. An Annual Subscription of a member who is an artist, an educationalist or a student is Five Dollars (limited number). Any donation, however small it may be, is most thankfully received.

Privileges: A member is entitled to admission to at least four gatherings and to a complimentary seat for at least two dramatic performances during the year.

Service to Humanity: Each member renders a great service to the cause which, when realized, will bring universal brotherhood and permanent peace among all nations.

K. N. Das Gupta, Director.
67 W. 44*th St., New York City.*

A LETTER FROM GERMANY.

I have the pleasure to inform you, as a matter of some public interest, that the work of the American Friends' Service Committee, which consists primarily of feeding undernourished German children in over 1,600 cities and towns throughout the republic, has reached this week the largest record in the history of the work, and that it is at present furnishing warm meals to 1,100,000 children daily. It is not expected that this million-a-day record will be maintained for more than a month, because although the poverty of the German people, especially of the members of the middle class who live on fixed incomes, has not been fundamentally relieved, and cannot be, so long as the mark retains its present depreciated value, the food situation has somewhat improved. It is the intention of the American Friends' Service Committee to recommence its child feeding operations after the opening of schools at the end of August, with an approximate average of 500,000 meals a day, and with a somewhat reduced American staff. The German government is co-operating fully with the undertaking, is providing free transportation of the food from its arrival in Hamburg to more than 1,600 cities and towns, and has appropriated 100,000,000 marks to pay for the cost of the flour and sugar used in the menu. A staff of public-spirited German citizens, comprising more than 35,000 men and women, who co-operate in the task of preparing and serving the meals, make the work possible. There are now only 34 Americans in charge of the work in eight administrative districts. Mr. Herbert Hoover has discontinued all connection with the work of the A. F. S. C.

Cordially and sincerely yours,
Berlin, June 24, 1921. B. D. A.

THE COMMUNITY CHURCH AND THE NATION CHURCH.

The "Community Church," New York, of the Rev. Dr. John Haynes Holmes, editor, UNITY, Chicago, is an attempt to make every church become the minister not only to one sect or denomination, but to all in its locality, becoming as it were a leaven of community spirit, a regenerative and unifying agency for its environment,—a House of the Spirit where men may be at home with God and with one another! The other is the suggestion being made by Dr. Stanton Coit of the Ethical Church. Speaking of the State Church in England, Dr. Coit says:

"The reason why the national church is in such a backward stage of development is chiefly because at present the State Church *retards the process of unification of religious life throughout the ntiaon.* This condition of affairs can be denied by no one. Those who believe in the existing Establishment deplore that it has not been able to unify the nation, offending one-third and never touching another third. . . .

"The theory that a nation, in so far as it reverences ideals, is a church, does not in the least overlook the fact that there may be violent party strife between various religious groups. Nor does it even involve a disparagement or condemnation of such strife. A nation does not lose its unity in religion because of theological controversies, any more than it ceases to be a unit in civil life because of the antagonisms of various political parties. On the contrary, the true idea of a nation as a church, instead of favoring the suppression of religious differences and their discussion and of the organizing of new groups to advance new ideas, recognizes that ultimate harmony and real uniformity of belief and deep inward identity of insight and aspiration can never arise throughout any nation except as the result of the freest, boldest and most organized expression and propaganda of every fresh sentiment."

And to bring about this harmony Dr. Coit makes the following inspiring suggestions:

1. The nation itself, as an organic unit of psychic expression, is the Living Church, of which every citizen is inevitably a member.
2. All religious denominations constitute but so many organized parties for the expression of the nation's religion.
5. India is at present sadly defective as an organic unit of spiritual life; and the cure for this evil requires that all the churches shall awaken to a sense of their mission as standard bearers of the nation's ideals and shall co-operate to further this mission.
8. For the spiritual edification of the people, other literatures as well as Hindu Scriptures shall be drawn upon as Sacred Scripture—especially Indian literature—and used in religious meetings.
9. Preachers must employ general—especially Indian—history and not simply Scripture story and church tradition, for inspiring examples of human character, and thus present all history as sacred.
10. Regular conferences of the laity on the social issues of the day shall be given an equal place and dignity with prayer and praise meetings, as a discipline to true devotion.
11. When each nation is understood and respected by all others as an organic unit of spiritual expression, war between nations and the unjust aggressions which cause war, shall cease. (*Adapted.*)

The World and the New Dispensation. Calcutta, India.

The Community Pulpit

Sermons by
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
and
JOHN HERMAN RANDALL
of the Community Church, New York.

Subscription price, $1.00.

Address, *Secretary*,
61 East 34th Street New York City

Sermons now ready:

1. The Collapse of Civilization: Can Humanity Be Saved? (*Holmes.*)
2. Doors to Be Kept Open. (*Holmes.*)
3. Can We Still Believe in Progress? (*Randall.*)
4. Two Years After the War: The Vindication of Pacifism. (*Holmes.*)
5. The Great Society: How Long Can It Wear Its Old Garments? (*Randall.*)
6. What God Means to Me. (*Holmes.*)

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM—DOMESTIC

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 231
ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

Subscribe for and read UNITY—
Do not miss a single number!

UNITY is a weekly paper which for forty-two years, under the editorship of Jenkin Lloyd Jones, upheld the fundamental principles of religion, political economy, and social relations; and this policy is maintained under the new editors, John Haynes Holmes and Francis Neilson. During the War UNITY was steadfast to the cause of righteousness and good will among the peoples of the earth. It has constantly dealt with the grave economic and political problems of Europe and the rest of the world in a straightforward unflinching manner, and it has from time to time published information of deep interest to its readers with which no other paper in the United States has dealt. It is non-sectarian. It advocates free religion and equal opportunity, as the means of uniting all peoples in the bonds of fellowship and amity. UNITY seeks to direct the minds of its readers to all that is best in the world of thought as expressed in the literature of the day, and its literary reviews are not the least valuable part of the several departments which its staff conducts from week to week. There are men and women of international renown writing for its columns and its subscribers are to be found in all the important countries of the world.

If these principles appeal to you, will you not subscribe and interest your friends?

- -

UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY

700 Oakwood Boulevard Chicago, Illinois

$3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription to UNITY, or 50 cents for a ten weeks' trial subscription to UNITY. Single copies, 10 cents.

Name .....City .....

Street .....State .....